

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/277,417
Amdt. Dated 11/2/04
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 6/2/2004
Page 30 of 32

REMARKS

Claims 1-112 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 13-14, 18, 21, 22, 31, 40, 41, 60, 61, 70, 79-81, 89, 91-96, and 108-112 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and rejected Claims 21-22 and 60-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner objected to Claims 4-12, 15-17, 18-20, 23-30, 32-39, 42-59, 62-69, 71-78, 82-89, 90, 97-98 and 99-107 but indicated that the prior art that the Examiner searched failed to disclose the subject matter of those claims. Claims 1, 3, 31, 40, 70, 79, 91-92, 94-96, and 108-109, 111 and 112 have been amended in the foregoing amendment.

Claims 1-3, 13-14, 18, 21, 22, 31, 40, 41, 60, 61, 70, 79-81, 89, 91-96, and 108-112 Are Not Anticipated by Aziz

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 13-14, 18, 21, 22, 31, 40, 41, 60, 61, 70, 79-81, 89, 91-96, and 108-112 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,548,646 to Aziz et al. ("Aziz"). The Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 40, 79, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 108, 109, 111 and 112

In the foregoing amendment, the Applicants have clarified that the claimed personalized access ticket includes other information indicating an access right, such that the secure communication service can verify the access right of the sender with respect to the recipient, according to the personalized access ticket, for the purpose of controlling the accesses between the sender and the recipient.

As shown in Figs. 1, 2 and 8 of the present specification, the personalized access ticket is not a data packet for conveying email message text. Rather, it is a ticket to be used in controlling accesses which is personalized to each user so that a user who has a valid ticket is allowed access.

In contrast, the encapsulation header of the data packet of *Aziz* fails to describe information indicating an access right or a personalized access ticket, other than the sender's identification and the recipient's identification. *Aziz* fails to disclose access control based on information indicating an access right, wherein the information is distinct from the sender's

ATLLIB01 1851201.1

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/277,417
Amdt. Dated 11/2/04
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 6/2/2004
Page 31 of 32

identification and the recipient's identification used in the correspondence. Thus, independent Claims 1, 40, 79, 91, 92, 94, 95, 96, 108, 109, 111 and 112 are not anticipated by *Aziz*.

Claims 31, 70, 93 and 110

In the foregoing amendment, the Applicants clarified that the method of Claim 31 comprises controlling email accesses according to the anonymous identification of each user on a communication network, and that the communication system of Claim 70 comprises an access control for controlling email accesses according to the anonymous identification of each user on the communication network. The invention of Claims 31, 70, 93 and 110 is characterized by the use of anonymous identification so that a user cannot be personally identified by the anonymous identification. The use of anonymous identification distinguishes the invention from those prior art methods and systems that only use user identifications that personally identify the user. For example, *Aziz* fails to disclose any teaching directed to such an anonymous identification and its use for email communications. Thus, Claims 31, 70, 93 and 110 are not anticipated by *Aziz*.

Claims 2-3, 13, 14, 18, 21-22, 41, 60-61, 80 and 81

Claims 2-3, 13, 14, 18, 21-22, 41, 60-61, 80 and 81 depend from either one of independent Claims 1, 40, and 79. The remarks made above in support of the patentability of the independent claims are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from *Aziz*.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/277,417
Amdt. Dated 11/2/04
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 6/2/2004
Page 32 of 32

Information Disclosure Statement

In the Second Response which was submitted on March 10, 2004, the Applicants re-submitted PTO/SB/08 filed on March 26, 1999 because the publication number of one of the references cited, namely JP8-293,883, was incorrectly shown as JP8-293,881, while the references enclosed were correct. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the cited information and return the PTO/SB/08 indicating that the Examiner has considered the cited information.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes 6559/

By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471/233993